

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 11, 19, and 22 have been amended and no new claims have been added.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-22 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

An IDS is being filed concurrently with this response listing the A5 reference (Nagy, *The Apache SOAP Deployment Descriptor*) referred to in the IDS filed August 7, 2003. A publisher and place of publication have been listed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the listed document be considered by the Examiner and be made of record in the present application and that an initialed copy of Form PTO/SB/08 be returned in accordance with MPEP §609.

Drawings

Figure 1 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(o) because it lacked suitable descriptive legends. In response, Applicant has amended Figure 1 to include legends for each of the components therein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of Figure 1 and that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 19-21 were rejected for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, independent claim 19 has been amended to recite a computer-readable medium. Accordingly, claim 19 is now directed to statutory subject matter and Applicant respectfully

requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 19 be allowed. Claims 20-21 depend from claim 19, and are therefore also directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant also requests that the rejection to claims 20-21 be withdrawn and that claims 20-21 be allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 21 were rejected as being indefinite for failing to point out which Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) the claims are directed to. As stated in the “Background of the Invention,” SOAP is a “protocol layered on top of HTTP ... which allows Automation objects to be invoked over the Internet via Web servers.” The protocol described in U.S. Patent No. 6,457,066 (“the ‘066 patent”) and the protocol implemented by Apache Axis were included as examples of implementations of SOAP, not as definitions of SOAP. In other words, these implementations are only subsets of a larger SOAP class that is compatible with the applicant’s invention. Thus claims 6-9, 15-18, and 21 do not refer only to the ‘066 patent’s SOAP implementation or to the Apache Axis SOAP implementation, but the claims refer to any implementation that a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize as a SOAP implementation. The wide ranging application of the applicant’s invention is buttressed by its compatibility with “other software and protocols, such as various TCP messaging protocols.” ([0011]). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 6-9, 15-18 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 19-21 were rejected for being indefinite because claim 19 was grammatically incorrect. In response, claim 19 has been amended and is now grammatically correct. Thus claim 19 and claims 20-21, which depend from claim 19, are no longer indefinite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 19-21 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 11, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0083191 (“Ryuutou”). In response, without agreeing with or acquiescing to the rejection, independent claims 1, 11, and 22 have been amended to further distinguish the claimed invention from Ryuutou. Thus, applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 22 are directed towards a method, machine, and apparatus used to identify the source of an object call on a data server in a distributed computing environment. When a client computer sends a message to invoke an object on a data server, the source of the object call on a data server is identified by examining the class names of the objects on the execution stack of a client server and comparing each class name with the name of a class known to send messages from the client server to a data server. When a match is found, the invention returns the name of the class of the next object on the execution stack. This returned class name is the name of the class that called the class that sends messages from the client server to the data server. Therefore, this is the class on the client computer that is invoking an object on a data server.

One advantage of the claimed invention is that it does not require a user to explicitly pass the source of an object call (e.g., in a header or as a parameter of the object call) from a client computer to a server in order to identify the source of the call at a different node in a network (e.g., a client server or data server). By utilizing a comparison algorithm on the execution stack, the claimed invention avoids the increased programming effort and higher probability of error associated with manually passing an object identifier.

In Ryuutou, the client computer identifier (i.e. IP address) is passed in “URL or header information” in a “communication connection request.” ([0053]). In Ryuutou, the client computer is identified. In contrast, the method and apparatuses as claimed in amended claims 1, 11, and 22, identify the calling object on the client computer. Furthermore, in Ryuutou, the client computer identification information is sent in a header or a URL and thus has no need for, and does not utilize, a comparison algorithm.

Thus, in view of the limitations added to independent claims 1, 11, and 22, these claims are now patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 1, 11, and 22 be allowed. Dependent claims 2-10 and 12-18 depend from claims 1 or 11 respectively, and should therefore also be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Dependent claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of US Pat. No. 6,651,109 (“Beck”). Dependent claims 4

and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of Beck and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,247,615 ("Mori"). Dependent claims 5 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of Beck, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,115,719 ("Purdy"). Dependent claims 6-9 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,457,066 ("Mein"). Dependent claim 10 and independent claim 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,768,552 ("Jacoby"). Dependent claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of Jacoby, and further in view of Purdy. Dependent claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryuutou in view of Jacoby, and further in view of Mein.

As stated above in connection with amended claims 1 and 11, Ryuutou does not disclose identifying the calling object from the execution stack on the client server by a comparison algorithm. Furthermore, Beck, Mori, Purdy, Mein, and Jacoby do not cure the deficiencies of Ryuutou. Thus, dependent claims 3-10, and 12-18 which depend from claims 1 or 11 are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 3-10 and 12-18 be allowed.

Independent claim 19 has also been amended to include the limitations discussed above, namely using a comparison algorithm to identify the calling object from an execution stack. Dependent claims 20-21 depend from claim 19 and are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim on which they ultimately depend. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 20-21 be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

